UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,829	03/07/2006	Fumihiko Ishikawa	4456-0105PUS1	6864
	7590 11/12/201 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 220/0 07/7	SCHULTZ, JAMES		
FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1633		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/560,829	ISHIKAWA ET AL.	
Fugueline i	A 4 11 14	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	James (Doug) Schulz, Filb	1033	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	(f).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	allian as with 07 OFD 44 07 mount had		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extention Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the companion of the Notice of Appeal has been filed. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further contact. 			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		L 50.011),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	,	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)):	,	•
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	kplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 46-48.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>45-46</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4,6,34,36 and 39-44</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5,7,9-24,27,35,37</u>	7 and 45.		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	/James (Doug) Schultz Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitations of claim 46-48 were previously objected to, but were indicated as being considered allowable if moved into the claim from which they depend, claim 1. The proposed claim amendment amended claim 1, which ostensibly put the that claim in condition for allowance. However, claim 2 was also amended to recite the limitations of claims 46-48. These limitations had never previously been considered in the context of claim 2, which is drawn to a mouse rather than the newborn mouse of claim 1. Since at least claim 2 is a product claim which recites a mouse that is obtained as a result of breeding the newborn mouse of claim 1, and since the newborn mouse of claim 1 is created by implanting hematopoietic stem cells and which are further required to maintain a particular level of engraftment as the newborn mice mature, it is not clear whether progeny mice derived from claim 1 would retain the level of engraftment claimed in claim 2. If no engraftment is maintained, then any IL2-null mouse such as those sold by Jackson Laboratories would read on the claim. If engraftment is maintained, it is not clear that such progeny mice would retain the claimed level of engraftment, and thus there would be questions under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph enablement that have not been explored during the course of prosecution. Either way such an amendment raises new issues not previously considered and entry of the proposed claim amendment is refused. Furthermore, entry of the proposed claim amendment would trigger rejoinder of process claims which have not been examined, which also raises new considerations. Entry is refused for this matter as well.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: No arguments are presented that are directed to the claims as they are currently pending.